Mr. Ben Bradlee
The Washington Post
1150 15 St., NW
Washington, D.C. 20071

2/21/90

Dear Ben,

When my no longer photographic memory led me to confuse Rodriguez and Fernandez, about which I wrote you, I'd mislaid the clipping I recalled inaccurately. I'd misfiled it in a folder I keep in a "desk orgabizaer" that, with my medical problems and limitations, sometimes becomes a disorganizer. I send it on the chance you may want a reporter to have it or may want it for your morgue. It was copied by a then asistant DA in Indianapolis who'd attended a week of seminars I'd conducted at his university. His unused letter to the editor is attached.

What follows is for your information and requires no response. I send it to give you a better understanding of the actualities when JFK was assassinated and of the nature and thrust of my work because unlikely as it now may seem there may come a time when the matter is again of public and journalistic interest. All I have will in time be a public archive at local Hood College.

Since 1977 it has not been safe for me to drive to Washington and for 15 years I've had to sit with my legs elevated. I can't stand still and have problems filing. From time to time local civic organizations have asked me to speak to them and I've kept a small file of documents I've used in these talks and discussions. It was in this folder that I misfiled the UPI story on Bush and terrorists.

I do regret that you never were interested in asking me what my work disclosed, and I regretted this more when I learned that the Post had invited those I regard as irresponsible conspiracy theorists to hear and question. Of the many Post reporters who did consult me over the years I believe that only George Lardner is still with you. I am confident he will tell you that I was never a conspiracy theorist and from the first made a by now rather large study of how our institutions worked in that time of great stress and since then. I am also confident that he will tell you that he never found me factually incorrect. As Paul Valentine will, I'm sure, with regard to the King assassination when he saw my work on that tested in federal district court in Memphis at the Ray evidentiary hearing he covered when I was Ray's investigator, conducted the investigation that got him the evidentiary hearing that had been denied him and the investigation for that hearing. The prosecution did not and could not rebut the witnesses I located and produced. It is my record for accuracy that embarrassed me so when I misinformed you about Fernandez.

The few records I've copied from those I keep for these local appearances do address how our institutions then worked. To a rather limited degree but I think with fairness. I regard the assassination of any president as the most subversive of crimes in a sociaty like ours. It nullifies our system of self-government, for one thing.

As I've arranged them, the first of the enclosed records is a memo Courtney Evans, the lisison with the AG's office, sent to Belmont, then the channel to Hoover. The marks at the bottom indicate that DeLoach and Tolson read the memo before it was handed to Hoover.

The Katzenback memo to Moyers to which he refers was used by the Post when the FBI made its general JFK assassination disclosures 12/77 and 1/78, in what I regard as a damage control operation that did not have that effect, for history if not for the press, because I filed FOIA lawsuits and obtained considerably more that the FBI tried to withhold. I enclose the FBI's file copy, Katzenbach's hand-written copy of the day before, which is to say as soon as Oswald was killed and he anticipated there would not be any trial, and a Department copy, from the files of Howard P. Willens.

You have no reason to remember it but when I spoke to you in early 1966 and showed

you two pages of the FBI's five-volume and supposedly definitive report requested by LBJ, you sent Larry Stern and Dan Kurzman to pose questions to Willens. They asked me to provide those questions and I sat in your newsroom and off the top of the head gave then a single page, single spaced. They told me on their return that he had not satisfied them. Those two pages appear next. They reflect that in all five volumes of that report there is virtually no mention of the assassination itself, with only casual mention of the shooting and that in disagreement with the later office account, and not even the President wounds are explained. It is only a diatribe against Oswald.

Hoover had an instant vision that there was a lone, nut assassin, and I can send you records on that I do not have on my desk. The entire FBI knew this instantly or had the same vision. Reflecting this is a record your people did not get in those general disclosures and is one of many thousands I got from the Dallas files. It was never sent to Washington. It shows that when a nearby police department suggested suspects, with legitimate basis, because I have three then contemporaneous and reported threats against JFK by those people, it was researched through the indices, with notations made, indexed and filed before Oswald was charged. The supervisory agent's notation is "not necessary to follow as true subject located." Whether or not at the time this notation was added the supversory agent knew Oswald's name he didn't note it. And were it true that Oswald had been the assassin there had not been any investigation possible by the time this was in the files and there certainly was no reason to assume he was alone, that there had not been any conspiracy. This was the day of the assassination.

The next record, like the Katzenbach memo, was the first working day after the assassination. It also was never sent to Washington. Two Dallas special agents viewed still and motion pictures of the assassination and its scene taken by an engineer. They told the special agent in charge that although the still pictures "did depict the President's car at the precise time shots were fired" they" were not sufficiently clear for identification purposes." Translation from FBI into English, the pictures are valueless, even though they show the President being killed and a great amount of background and people in it, because they do not show Oswald with a smoking gun. Of the movies the report says, "they (sic) failed to show the building from which the shots were fired." Aside from the presumption of the conclusion of the investigation barely begun, this is false. After I got this record two reporter friends, one then radio and the other Dallas Morning News, examined and borrowed Bronson's footage. It has 87 different pictures of not only the building but the very window from which Oswald allegedly fired all the shots. The paper's three or four full pages of coverage included more than an entire page of reproductions of individual frames of the film. (I added the lines on this and the next record.)

When the Warren Commission was nearing the end of its work, having adopted the fiction that a single bullet inflicted all the wounds on both victims, it had the problem of explaining away the fact that the shooting, in addition, inflicted a negligle wound on a bystander, James Tague. He was at the opposite end of Dealey Plaza. When the Morning News photographer, Tom Dillard, read the leaks of the Commission's coming conclusions he told the United States Attorney about this so-called "missed" shot and gave him a photograph of it he had taken. The USA forwarded it to the Commission and it had the FBI send a lab agent, who was a photographic expert, to make an investigation. The Dallas agents had not been able to find the small hole or nick caused at the bend of the concrete curbstone. The lab agent, Lyndal Shaneyfelt, had the piece of curbstone dug up, flown to Washington and examined in the lab. What I enclose is the synopsis page of a much larger report. It was written by the JFK assassination Dallas case agent. He said that although there had been a nick it was no longer visible! Notwithstanding this, and this was not reported to the Commission and was not testified to by Shaneyfelt, who did testify, the FBI proceeded with a spectrographic examination the results of which were not given to the Commission. I got the report and related information by FOIA litigation. Only two of the dozen elements of the bullet were identified by spectrographic examination. My examination, visual and by feeling, makes it apparent that the damage to the curbstone was patched. It

is obvious that the curbstone was patched, with concerte of obviously different composition. It is smoother and darker. My opinion since has been confirmed by an expert whose report I have. What makes this a bit hairier is the fact that when Tague was going to visit his parents in Indiana in May of 1964 he returned to Dealey Plaza to take a movie of the nick or hole in the curbstone and it then no longer existed. There is no FBI or Warren Commission REFLECTING how the Commission's attorney knew two months later that Tague had taken his movies and Tague got no response when in his testimony he asked, but the Commission knew of the film and had it and thus could have seen that the hole had been patched. After that Tague's home was robbed and all that he found missing was this reel of 8 mm film.

The next four pages are from an FBI tickler, disclosed to a friend under FOIA compulsion. He sued when I was not able to. It appears to be a damage-control outline of what the FBI might have to face before Congress. The litigation was for what the FBI gave the House Select Committee on Assassinations. I placed the paperclips on the right margin in making this copy to use in a lawsuit.

On the first page the first paperclip refers to the destruction of a threat Oswald hand-delivered to the Dallas FBI a couple of weeks before the assassination. His threat, in the internal investigation the FBI was forced to make after the information was leaked to the Dallas Times-Herald, was to bomb. Recollections of the numerous FBI people who saw that threat differ. Some said it was to bomb the FBI office, some the police headquarters and some both. But the FBI was embarrassed the afternoon of the crime when Hosty, the Dallas Oswald case agent, told a police intelligence officer that they knew Oswald had the capability but didn't expect any trouble from him. However, the FBI's explanation of not notifying the police of Oswald's presence is that he was not known to have any tendency foward violence. "Handled" means destroyed - as soon as Oswald was killed. Hosty was told to get rid of it by the special agent in charge and he tore it up and flushed it down the toilet. He then lied under oath to the Warren Commission in saying Oswald had given no indication of any violent tendencies and was praised for this perjury by the FBI. (Other FBI reports say Oswald beat his wife so apparently wife-beating is as non-violent to the FBI as bombing.)

Where the paperclip is on the second page, Alex Rosen then headed the General Investigative Division.

Of what I marked on the third page, note the preparation of staff dossiers after the Report was filed, the second set of dossiers on the staff, and on the Commission members (bottom next page). Sullivan is not the only source on the FBI's leaking of the five-volume report LBJ ordered. Preparing sex-dossiers on the critics, except for Mark Lane, has not, to the best of my knowledge, been leaked or used.

I do hope you'll take time to read this and form your own opinion. For all you know about the FBI, it still may be informative. And entertaining?

Although the next record relates to the ~~first on the~~ Katzenbach memo the "record" copy of it is not in the JFK assassination file, 62-109060, as the others are. It is in a 94 file. The title of 94 classification records is "Research Matters" and within my experience the FBI not only did not disclose them, it refused to when they were relevant in my litigation. It is one of the file classifications in which it hides, making the claim that "research" is not relevant. Thus it hides electronic surveillances in "66. Administrative Matters" (known as "admats") and claims administrative matters are not relevant. I've never had a voluntary disclosure of any 66 file. Much of the number was eliminated in xeroxing but I believe it is a file on your paper and its people. I do recall one on Chalmers Roberts, though.

Katzenbach wrote his memo out in longhand Sunday, 11/24/63. He had it typed in the office the next day, the 25th. The typist had to consult him about some of his writing and then it was typed. A copy was hand-delivered to Evans, who hand-delivered it to Belmont, with a memo he had typed to explain it. Yet so urgent was it to the FBI

that the Post be influenced to oppose formation of a Presidential commission that De Loach had digested it, after consulted with others, and was in touch with Al Friendly by 10:50 a.m. He was, he wrote Mohr, then his channel to Hoover, "perfectly honest." They were going to do, their cliche, a "no stones unturned" investigation of which I give you some slight indication herewith. And in supporting a commission the Post was going to "muddy the waters." A commission would, rather a Post editorial supporting one, "would merely serve to confuse."

I hope you'll read it all and form your own opinion. Mine is that you were had and that this was the FBI's, especially Hoover's and De Loach's, intent.

So you will not have to take my word for what that "no stones unturned" investigation boasted of to the Post does not include I've copied a few pages of its index. There is no listing of the assassination or of the autopsy. After the two Kennedys on page 80 Khruschev is the next listing. As the Bronx on page 76 is important enough to be indexed, and California, and the assassination isn't, Japan is indexed on 80 but there is no listing of President Kennedy's wounds. The Russian langauge and Southampton, England are indexed on 86 but there is no mention of the shots fired in the assassination. Among the reflections of the FBI's concept of what was important on page 88 are University of Turku, Finland, Vietnam and the Dallas Young Men's Christian Association. But no mention of wounds. This is more like a travelogue than an assassination that the FBI reflects in its index.

I began my work broke and in debt and I'd just gone farthur in debt to print the book, so I could not afford to buy those five volumes at 25¢ a page and I did not have the index to show you when I gave you those two pages.

I'm asking nothing of you, not even an acknowledgement. I seek nothing, and if you remember, after I gave you those two pages I asked nothing of you or the Post. I do consider that FOIA made me surrogate for the people once I filed the series of lawsuits over one of which the Act was amended in 1974 to open the files of the FBI, CIA and other such agencies. Anybody has access to what now consume about 60 file cabinets and more boxes than I can remember and to copies. Most of those using these things will, I know, say what I do not agree with and do think will mislead and misinform the people but there is no restriction on access.

I began this work with a different background than any of the others called critics. I'd been a reporter, investigative reporter, Senate investigator and editor and wartime (OSS) intelligence analyst. I'd survived some pretty rough experiences beginning with the Dies committee, which sought to entrap me and did, among other evil things. When it tried to indict me I took the grand jury away from the United States Attorney and it indicted the Dies agent, for whom Dies, in public, copped a plea. Your morgue holds this and more of my informal education when I was young. Including getting caught up in a right-wing pogrom when my OSS component was transferred to State. I organized the learned and timid, got us good defense counsel, and we won, were reinstated and resigned. So, I was prepared as one isn't in formal education and is fortunate not to be in real life for the kind of inquiry for which there is no teaching. And in seven published books on this very controversial subject not one person has written me to complain that I treated him unfairly and there is no single, significant error in any of them and very few insignificant ones. I do not intend this as boasting. But I am saying that after very close scrutiny by those who have every interest in undermining my work, it hasn't happened. The work stacks. Today it is used in colleges and universities and I keep it available when that is not easy for me with the first book. I provide acceptable xeroxes because I can't handle a printing. Right now, after open-heart surgery, I'm limited to 10 pounds in what I can lift. So, I'm not asking anything of you, I am trying to inform you and to give you an idea of what can now or in the future be consulted if there is ever the need or interest.

I'm sorry about my typing but it can't be better with my vision and having to sit with the mill to the side.

Sincerely, Harold Weisberg

Harold